

the district of country over which these sixty-six bishops presided the only part of the world, then, in which Infant Baptism existed? And does this corrupted region of the advocates of celibacy, and of the use of oil and ointment in baptism, so dominate over the rest of the Christian world, so terrify or seduce the whole visible church of Christ, or pretended Christians, that not a single voice, not a word, not a syllable, by any person whatever for at least one thousand years, Catholic or heretic, or schismatic, Pelagian, or Augustinian, was ever written or uttered against this most, according to your recent sect, unscriptural, ungodly practice of baptizing infants, so destructive to true piety, to the true interest of God's Holy Church, while such determined, I had almost said fierce, contests were raised about matters of, certainly in some cases, not superior, in others of decidedly inferior, importance? As to the first class, whether heretical baptism, if performed in due manner and with proper words, was or was not valid; of the latter kind, whether the paschal, or, as we call it, Easter feast, should be kept on the fourteenth day of March or April, or on the Sunday following. You will probably adduce Tertullian to the contrary, who recommends the delay of the baptizing of little children (*parvulorum*); but does Tertullian intimate in the least degree that the baptizing of little children, infants included as we say, not boys of ten years old, that the baptizing of infants is unlawful, unscriptural? Certainly not; for he recommends the same delay for young persons and widows.